

**LABORATORY CERTIFICATION STANDARDS REVIEW COUNCIL  
MEETING MINUTES FROM 11/04/98**

---

## **Attendance**

DNR Staff: Jack Sullivan, Alfredo Sotomayor and Dan Olson

Council Members: Mary Christie (Chair), David Kollakowsky, Ruth Klee Marx, Bill Sonzogni, Bill Bruins, Debbie Cawley, and Russ Janeshek. Gilbert Williams (Vice-chair), and Barb Hill were absent.

Guests: Barb Burmeister (SLH), Paul Harris (Davy Labs), Paul Junio (NET, Inc), Greg Zelinka (Madison MSD), M. Suha (En Chem, Inc.), R.T. Krueger (Northern Lake Service), and Steve Heraly (Robert E. Lee and Associates, Inc.).

## **Action Item Summary**

- The Council suggested that DNR look at Reference Sample Failures and prepare a summary for the Council's review.
- The Council recommended the DNR conduct a survey of the labs in the state of Wisconsin, in concert with the Wisconsin lab community, to better determine the fiscal impact of NELAC standards implementation.
- The next Certification Standards Review Council meeting was tentatively set for Thursday, February 11<sup>th</sup>, 1999, from 10am to 3pm.

## **Agenda Items**

- I. Approval of September 10<sup>th</sup>, 1998 Meeting Minutes
  - A. **A motion was made to accept the September 10<sup>th</sup>, 1998 meeting minutes, it was seconded and the minutes were unanimously accepted.**
- II. Agenda Repair
  - A. Jack Sullivan announced that he had information to share with the Council regarding reference sample failures.
    1. There were 47 enforcement actions taken on reference sample failures.
    2. No single area had a significantly higher failure rate.
    3. The highest number of failures occurred in the acid herbicides.
    4. The Council suggested that DNR look at how many samples of a particular analyte are submitted, and determine what percentage of those fail.
    5. The Council recommended that the DNR should be consistent with enforcement actions.
  - B. The Chair proposed that the Council discuss a recommendation to the DNR regarding internal communication amongst DNR Bureaus.
    1. The Council asks that the Department involve its own in-house expertise, and the Council's expertise, early in each policy/rule-making process to ensure the participation of the best technical experts and consistency among programs.

**LABORATORY CERTIFICATION STANDARDS REVIEW COUNCIL**  
**MEETING MINUTES FROM 11/04/98**

---

III. Discussion of NELAC TAC recommendations with Alfredo Sotomayor

A. TAC Recommendation:

1. **The DNR should become a NELAP-recognized accrediting authority.**
2. **Some** laboratories currently under NR 149 should be covered by NELAC (also referred to as the **“Some Option”**):
  - a) **ALL** laboratories performing work for profit.
  - b) Not-for-profit laboratories that perform tests in categories higher than categories 1-4 (BOD, NH<sub>3</sub>, Solids, PO<sub>4</sub>), unless those tests are titrimetric or by ISE.
  - c) Most “small” municipal and industrial laboratories **would not** be required to join the NELAC group.
3. Laboratories NOT in the NELAC compulsory group can join it voluntarily.
4. Not-for-profit laboratories would file status statements that would be overseen by a defined entity.
5. The current “registration” option under NR 149 would be abolished.
6. Laboratories in the non-NELAC group would abide by provisions currently applicable to certified laboratories:
  - a) Revocation for repeated failure of reference samples.
  - b) Stronger enforcement.

B. Advantages of NELAP accreditation:

1. If a lab is certified in one state, there is no need to certify for other states.
2. Good for multi-state labs.
3. If NELAP were compulsory, lab data would be of higher quality (debatable).

C. Disadvantages of NELAP accreditation:

1. Increased cost of doing business for all labs, especially the smaller labs, if NELAP is compulsory:
  - a) Cost increases variable on scope of compliance.
  - b) Cost increases variable on number of samples the lab processes.
  - c) Lab may have to add equipment to comply.
  - d) Lab personnel may have to meet higher educational requirements.
  - e) Increase in internal costs of compliance may average 5-10%, but may vary from that prediction depending on the individual lab.
  - f) Difficult to predict the impact on DNR fees, since it is unknown if NELAP will be compulsory for all labs, for some labs and how the new standards will increase DNR's costs.
2. If not compulsory, difficult to determine who is required to be in NELAP.
3. Difficult to administer if NELAP is compulsory in some states, and not in others.

- D. Council member Bill Sonzogni made the following Motion: **“We ask the Department (DNR) to give careful consideration to the ‘Some Option’. The Council recognizes that there is still uncertainty within the lab community of the definition of the ‘Some Option’. We ask the Lab Certification Program to compile as much information as possible on the cost to implement NELAC standards to the lab community.”** The motion was seconded and carried unanimously.

**LABORATORY CERTIFICATION STANDARDS REVIEW COUNCIL**  
**MEETING MINUTES FROM 11/04/98**

---

- E. A second motion was made by the Council as follows: **“We recommend the DNR conduct a survey of the labs in the state of Wisconsin, in concert with the Wisconsin lab community, to better determine the fiscal impact of NELAC standards implementation.”**. The motion was seconded and carried unanimously.

V. Future Meeting Date

- A. **The next Certification Standards Review Council meeting was tentatively set for February 11<sup>th</sup>, 1998.**
- B. The program will work with the Chair to set up the next meeting. The Council members should contact the Chair or Vice-chair to get items on the next meeting's agenda.
- C. A motion was made to adjourn, it was seconded, and unanimously accepted.